STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of CORRY PARNEY, TRAVIS HANCOCK, and DESIREE HANCOCK, Minors.

JASON HANCOCK and BETHENY HANCOCK,

Petitioners-Appellees,

v

TRAVIS A. HANCOCK,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JEREMY JOHNSON and MELANIE PARNEY,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED
November 9, 2004

No. 255927
Kent Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 03-007500-NA

Before: Murray, P.J., and Sawyer and Smolenski, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the order of the trial court terminating his parental rights to his minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(e) and (g). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in determining that the statutory grounds were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991). The children were placed in the guardianship of petitioners after respondent-appellant was incarcerated. Upon his release, respondent-appellant left the children in petitioners' care and supported the children only sporadically. Petitioners eventually filed a petition seeking termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights. Upon the agreement of the parties, however, the trial court held the petition in abeyance while the parties undertook a reintegration plan instituted and supervised by the court by which respondent-appellant might have, upon completion of the plan, regained custody of the children. Respondent-appellant failed to comply with the plan, however, and the court terminated the plan.

Respondent-appellant concedes that he did not successfully complete the reintegration plan but argues that lack of time caused by his work obligations and lack of money constituted good cause for noncompliance within the meaning of MCL 712A.19b(3)(e). We disagree.

These arguments might have been more persuasive had respondent-appellant made a good-faith effort to comply with all aspects of the plan. In reality, respondent-appellant made little effort to comply with the plan other than to regularly visit the children. Respondent-appellant also argues that his noncompliance with the plan did not cause a disruption in the parent-child relationship. Again, we disagree. Though respondent-appellant maintained regular contact with the children, he exerted little other effort toward reunification. Respondent-appellant willingly abdicated all parental responsibility, including financial support, to petitioners, choosing visiting as the only aspect of parenting in which he would participate. There was no indication that respondent-appellant would have been more willing or more able to undertake those responsibilities in the future.

Furthermore, the trial court did not err in determining that termination was not contrary to the best interests of the children. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although respondent-appellant visited regularly with the children and presumably established a bond with them, there was no evidence that preserving this bond outweighed the other factors considered by the trial court.

Affirmed.

/s/ Christopher M. Murray
/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski